

SENATOR VANCE AND THE SUB-TREASURY BILL.

Special Correspondence State Chronicle.

As an Alliance man and a Democrat I have felt some anxiety as to the probable outcome of the discussion in regard to Senator Vance's letter on the Sub-Treasury bill. From my standpoint it looks like a misfortune that Senator Vance should have felt it his duty to write such a letter. The injudicious comments of the Progressive Farmer (for which—although the Farmer is the official organ of the State Alliance, and its owner and nominal editor the President of the National Alliance—nobody is responsible except the young man who wrote the article) were calculated to magnify a slight misfortune into a great evil. For, after all, Mr. Editor, what is it that all this ado is about? A slight difference of opinion between Gov. Vance and the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union as to the best means of accomplishing a certain end. I cannot see, Mr. Editor, that the circumstances are such as to render it necessary that the people of North Carolina, in the Alliance or out of it, should repudiate either Senator Vance or the Sub-Treasury plan. The Senator's letter will, I fear, do great damage. It will create in the minds of much the larger portion of the non-Alliance element of the Democratic party in this State a prejudice against the Sub-Treasury plan that will be practically insurmountable.

The confidence of the people of North Carolina in Vance's purity, integrity, patriotism and devotion to what he believes to be the best interests of his people remains, and will remain, unshaken. All that you say of Vance in your editorial of the 16th inst. is true, and will be endorsed by every intelligent Allianceman in the State. That is where the trouble comes. If a weak, bad, ignorant or unreliable man goes wrong, he does but little damage, because he has no following. But when a great, good and wise man, who has always been regarded as a safe leader goes wrong in a crisis like the present, the damage that he does is immense.

But I want to say a few words about a communication, signed "Observer," in your issue of the 16th inst. This communication, in my opinion, garbles and misrepresents, unintentionally, I suppose, the National Economist's review of Vance's letter. It certainly misrepresents the provisions of the sub-treasury bill; while your correspondent's reference to "Senator Vance's admirable presentation of his objections to the bill" is calculated to excite the risibles of any man having a particle of humor in his communication, who has read the Senator's letter with any care. It certainly must be highly amusing to Vance himself. I have read and re-read the letter very carefully, and I fail to find in it anywhere any evidence that it ever occurred to the writer that it was being directed to the people of North Carolina in opinion in regard to any question of public policy, anything more was necessary than a general statement of his approval or disapproval. It is enough for Vance to say: "Boys, I object to this thing; it's wrong." It is wholly unnecessary to state the grounds of his "objections," or even to specify what his "objections" are; all we want to know is that Vance has "objections." This is the truth, and Vance knows it; he knows the people of North Carolina pretty well, and he is too old a sportsman to waste his ammunition on dead ducks. But there are two or three lapses which show that during the preparation of the letter his mind occasionally wandered to the Senate Chamber, and, for the moment, he lost sight of the fact that it was the people of North Carolina and not the Senate that he was addressing. These paragraphs take the form of an approach at least to a presentation of "his objections," as such I will not deny that they are "admirable." I will endeavor to quote them all. First: "I told both Col. Polk and Dr. Macune . . . that it was a great and radical departure from the accustomed policy of our legislation, and that there were questions, both of practicability and constitutionality, that I wished to reserve." MIRABILIUM!

Second, "My own position remains the same. I cannot support the bill in its present shape, but I am not opposed to the principles and purposes of the measure." MIRABILIUM!

Third, "We live, happily for us, in a government of limited powers, but because, as I believe, the present tariff duties are utterly unconstitutional, and but robbery under the forms of law, I cannot gain my consent to vote for this sub-treasury bill, which provides for the loaning of money to the people by the government, and which, in my opinion, is without constitutional authority." Notwithstanding the fact that the connection of the first clause with the remainder of this badly involved sentence is not very obvious, and it is not quite clear, from the construction, whether the Senator's reason for not supporting the sub-treasury bill is the utter unconstitutionality of the present tariff duties, or the absence of "constitutional authority" for the "loaning of money" to the people by the government, yet, inasmuch as it contains the word "because," and hence was presumably intended as a "presentation," not only of an "objection," but the reason therefor, I must exclaim, at this point, MIRABILIUM!

No, I will take that back; there is something a little further on more "admirable" still. "I notice with pain that much of the ill-feeling of the farmers is directed . . . against their neighbors and friends. . . . I observe that bitter feeling is springing up between town and country. . . . I need not say that this is all wrong," etc., etc., etc.

mitted in the arrangement of his "objections" and put what appears to me the strongest and most admirably presented last. Here it is: "Your great organization is not yet grown—I, e. it is not yet old enough to have a baby—consequently the Senator is afraid to risk the consequences of accepting the position of foster-father to the weakly looking offspring of an immature parent, lest on his hands. So much for what I suppose your correspondent means by the Senator's 'admirable presentation of his objections to the bill.'" And now to my charge against your correspondent of misrepresenting the Economist and the provisions of the Sub-Treasury Bill.

Take the whole article together and it is not fairly susceptible of the construction your correspondent puts upon it. The tenor of the article is to show that Vance has made a mistake, has done himself an injustice, and placed himself in a false position, a position that renders him liable to unjust suspicions. After quoting some colorable deductions which an evil minded person or one not thoroughly well acquainted with the Senator's character might draw from the letter in connection with the facts as stated, the Economist says: "If there be any who would ask these questions, do no doubt there will be, they would do the Senator great injustice and be altogether wrong. Those who know Senator Vance will never accuse him of the wrongs here implied. That his course has been wrong and that it has perpetrated a great wrong upon the Alliance movement cannot be denied; but that Senator Vance intended it should be, or has in any way intended any bad faith with the order, is denied most positively." The article of the Economist is republished entire in the Progressive Farmer of the 15th ult., and will well repay a careful reading. Unless the statements by the Economist of what it claims are facts in regard to the history of the bill and Vance's connection with it is a tissue of falsehoods, it seems almost impossible to resist the conclusion to which it arrives, which is practically this: That Vance was predisposed in favor of the bill; that upon examination he liked it better and better, but before he had proceeded far enough in his investigation to entirely remove from his mind all doubt in regard to the constitutionality and practicability of the measure, it was greeted with such a storm of opposition from the tools of the Wall Street Plutocracy, who have dictated the policy of the Democratic party up to this time that another question arose in his mind, which, in his estimation, overshadowed in importance either of both of those he had up to that time been considering. This question is as to the probable effect upon the prospects of the Democratic party. No doubt the arguments brought to bear upon him by the instruments and representations of the Plutocracy and the prospective loneliness of his position, in case he should advocate the bill, had the effect of shaking and weakening his growing confidence in the constitutionality and thorough practicability of the measure.

[This is a most unjust intimation. Senator VANCE could not be moved any sooner by the arguments of Plutocracy than the writer of this article, whom we know to be personally honest. It is not fair, and weakens his position, to make such a statement in regard to the incorruptible VANCE. EDITOR.]

While his letter may be an "admirable presentation of his objections to the bill," it is very hard to believe that it is a full and candid statement of all the considerations that have influenced him in his decision not to support it. It is very evident that the Senator had doubts of the measure in two respects—possibly three—I, e., its constitutionality, the question of political expediency, the general tone of his letter rather inclines to the idea that he had settled the last question in favor of the measure. Senator Vance is a Democrat, a partisan, a politician. He honestly believes that the political well-being of the people of this country is bound up in the success of the Democratic party, and he has no confidence in the ability of the Democratic party to succeed without the aid of New York or that New York can be carried unless the plutocrats are allowed to dictate the platform and policy of the party. This involves no imputation upon the honesty, integrity or patriotism of Senator Vance but only what the Economist, as well as thousands of the Senator's constituents and admirers regard as an error in judgment. Your correspondent says: "The Economist claims that the government may by taxation constitutionally draw money from the whole people and then loan it out to a limited number on deposit by them of certain specific farm products." The Economist makes no such claim, never has since I have been reading it, made any such claim, and the Sub-Treasury Bill contains no such provision. The Economist says: "Yet be (Vance) claims that it is unconstitutional for the government to accept a deposit having exchangeable and intrinsic value from anybody, and issue treasury notes and charge an interest of one per centum per annum." Where is the difference in principle between the national banking system and the Sub-Treasury plan? The money, in the shape of bank notes, furnished by the government to the national banks, is not taking out the existing volume of currency, by being drawn from the people by taxation, but is practically so much "flat money" added to the circulating medium of the country. It is a peculiar kind of money created for this particular purpose, and can be manufactured in any quantity necessary to meet the demand. So the treasury notes to be issued from these sub-treasuries are not to be taken out of the Treasury of the United States or drawn from the existing volume of the circulating medium, but are to be manufactured to order, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, to meet the demand as it arises under the operation of the law. Every dollar that finds its way into the hands of an individual under the operation of the proposed law would be so much added, for the time being, to the existing volume of the circulating medium of the country. In the case of the banks, the government deducts one per cent.

when the notes are issued, and it is called a tax. The Sub-Treasury bill provides that when the produce is removed from the warehouse, and the money returned, an increment of one per cent. shall be collected as interest. Again, Senator Vance spoke and voted against the Silver bill as it finally passed and became a law, but if he ever denounced it as unconstitutional I do not remember having seen or heard it so stated.

The National Economist of June 21 contains the following very just observations in regard to the House bill, and they apply with even more force to the bill as it finally became a law, for the so called compromise, as claimed by Senator Vance himself, and conclusively shown by Senator Cockrell, is a much more mischievous measure than the House bill. After explaining the meaning and effect of the bill, the Economist says: "It is in reality the Sub-Treasury plan with all its provisos, deceptions and misleading phrases, it means that the owners of silver bullion, which this bill makes a commodity, like pork or wheat or cotton, can deposit it in the government treasury, and the depositor receives a certain amount of legal tender treasury notes on each deposit, which he can use for any length of time and then return the notes and receive back his bullion, or, in lieu of that, sell it to the government for so much silver coin." Still,

"There is a difference plain to see
"Twixt twiddle-dum and twiddle-dee."

The National Constitution furnishes ample and abundant warrant for the National Banking Act and for the "Act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of treasury notes therefor," but cannot, by any means, be stretched to cover the sub-treasury plan. Senator Vance speaks of the Alliance movement as "little short of a revolution." The Senator ought to know that it is NOTHING "short of a revolution," and that "revolutions do not go backward." This contest is the people against the plutocrats. In the language of the Economist: "They (meaning the farmers)—the rank and file of both political parties,—Democrats in the South and Democrats and Republicans in the West, are contending against the domination of their favorite political party by a Wall street ring that furnishes millions of boodle money for campaign purposes. Most of the old-line politicians have more faith in money than in votes, because with money they can influence the press and buy the saloons. There is bound to be at no distant day a readjustment of party lines. If the leaders of the Democratic party in the South and West had the courage of their convictions, the party could be emancipated from the domination of the plutocracy. It is true that whenever the platform of the party is made to voice the honest sentiment of nine-tenths of those who vote the ticket, then we shall find the tools of the plutocracy and of the whiskey ring, who have up to this time dictated the policy of the party in the ranks of the enemy. But the loss in numbers in that direction will be much more than compensated by the gains in the agricultural sections of the North west, and besides, the party will then be homogeneous, homogeneous in principle of interest, thought and feeling will give a moral force that will be perfectly irresistible. But the party leaders seem to be blind and the press muzzled. I have never seen or heard of the Sub-Treasury Bill being published except in the Alliance papers. [It was published in FULL in THE CHRONICLE shortly after the meeting of the National Alliance in St. Louis last December. If we mistake not THE CHRONICLE was the first paper of any kind in the State to give its readers the full text of the bill.—EDITOR.]

Not in ten even of the intelligent reading men in the State, outside of the Alliance, seem to have any intelligent conception of its provisions or purposes.

[If so, it is not the fault of the CHRONICLE. We have printed five columns of communications in favor of the sub-treasury bill to one column in opposition to it; and our columns have been open to all writers for a discussion of its provisions and purposes.—EDITOR.]

I have never seen an expression of opinion or an attempted discussion of it by any one opposing or disapproving it that did not betray ignorance either of its provisions or purposes, or both.

ALLIANCE DEMOCRAT.

[The writer of the above communication, in a private note to the editor, says he knows that THE CHRONICLE is in favor of Fair Play. He says truly, and for that reason we always give a hearing to every side of all discussions, so that the people may judge with all the lights before them. Following this communication THE CHRONICLE feels compelled to say that the writer has, unintentionally, we are persuaded, fallen into two great errors of charging:

1. That Senator VANCE and other patriotic Democrats prefer party success to measures that will relieve the people; and

2. That the Democratic leaders fear to antagonize Wall street.

In regard to the first, our correspondent knows that all good men recognize a party only as a means to accomplish a desired end. Some speakers talk about a party as if it were something tangible and something that was controlled by a few men. In truth a good party is merely the boat that carries the needy man to the port where he may have a fair chance by labor to secure the bread that will support life. When it does not accomplish this purpose its members ought to make it do so or abandon it. But it would be foolish to abandon it and jump out into the sea without raft or life preserver. Senator VANCE may seem to advocate party first just as the preacher seems to advocate church above Christianity. But in reality he is doing nothing of the sort, and neither is the true preacher. The Democratic party was organized by

farmers, and whenever its policy has prevailed the farmers have prospered equally with all other classes. It has been when the Republican policy of Protection and Contraction have been impressed upon our legislation that the farmer has suffered beyond other people. The way—and the only feasible way—for us to secure the financial reforms needed is to give the Democratic party control of the government. Then, though we do not believe that legislation can make people prosperous, the burdens through excessive tariff taxation and the contraction of the currency would be removed, and a brighter and juster era would dawn. We are not of that number who believe that the Democratic party makes no mistakes. On the contrary we have more than a dozen times criticized some of the acts of its leaders vigorously, and we shall continue so to do when we think they deserve it. But nine-tenths of its leaders and rank and file favor the measures that will relieve agricultural depression, and their utterances and acts show it. The thing to do is to advocate proper measures through the Democratic party. If we all will exercise wisdom and patience and give the great party of the people the power, the needed legislation will be given. There is no government without parties, and can be none.

2. There may be Democrats who listen to the dictates Wall street. The intimation that Senator VANCE does so, either directly, or indirectly, does gross injustice to him, as such intimation does rank injustice to the great majority of the Democratic leaders. They are most all honest and poor, and it is a sad regret to us that every one of them is not as honest as Senator VANCE, and as free from the influence of the money power. THE CHRONICLE has frequently denounced the Democrats who have bought seats in the Senate as unworthy of trust, and declared that they should be driven out of the party. They don't belong in the Democratic party. Such fellows are naturally Republicans, and most of them belong to that party. The Democratic party is cursed with a few of them. But it is a mistake to suppose that they control the party. Like our friend, we have long desired to see the day when the South and West would stand together in politics. We believe the time is coming when there will be a nearer union between them. Let us do all that we can to secure and cement such a union, but let us not do so by retiring our greatest man, who is doing more than any other public man to bring it about, or by turning over the rule of our State government to the corrupt and dishonest plutocrats. Let us do all that we can to secure a union between the South and West above all things, but before surrendering the blessings of good government at home, we want some evidence that the West will join in the effort to secure the laws that will bring relief. Heretofore they have done a great deal of talking about defeating the protective legislation that fetters us, but they have steadfastly voted with their oppressors and ours. The Southern people are not so foolish as to surrender their Home Rule and give the negroes control in the mere hope the West will join them. Let the West first bring forth fruits.

In regard to Senator VANCE's position on the Sub-Treasury, let us say this: He is honest, and his record shows he will serve the people. It is not right to make this new measure the sole test of fitness. Many men who are earnestly, honestly and sincerely opposed to it will vote for Capt. ALEXANDER, Mr. GRADY and other Congressmen who favor the Sub-Treasury Bill. They ought to do so in order to secure their election. There are other great issues, and the question is, not one measure, but the best legislation upon all lines. Good men favor the Sub-Treasury. Good men oppose it. There ought not to be any quarrel between them if they are agreed upon the great fundamental principles of Home Rule, Low Tariff Tax and a better financial system which will give us the increased volume of currency which is needed to do the business of the country.—EDITOR.]

NEED THE WAREHOUSEMEN BE U. S. OFFICERS.

[Our State Chronicle]

Every one seems to be agreed that the condition of the farmers of the country is alarming. The agricultural classes of the country seem to feel most keenly the depressed condition of the country. The more they work, the less they realize. Their indebtedness is alarmingly on the increase, and their assets rapidly diminishing. The farmers believe that a law embodying the main features of the Sub-Treasury Bill will afford to them the most needed relief. I have attempted in two articles heretofore published in this paper to show that the bill, or rather the idea contained in the bill, is constitutional and desirable. It would be a great pity for the great idea to be killed, untied by the great zeal of its friends, or the opposition of its enemies. I see an article in the News and Observer in which it is stated that the National Economist charges Senator Vance with bad faith in changing the provision of the bill which provides for the election of the warehousemen as provided for in the original bill, and substituting therefor a provision that the warehousemen should be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, so as to conform to the requirements of the Constitution

of the United States; which provides that all United States officers whose election is not therein provided for, shall be appointed by the President, heads of departments, or courts.

I have not the bill before me, and cannot say whether the warehousemen therein provided for would be officers or not. I assume they would, though as the learned and accurate editor of the News and Observer assumes that they would, and says that Senator Vance thought so too.

The question that naturally arises is, shall this bill intended for the relief of farmers, and thought by wise men to be adequate to the requirements, be killed on account of the lack of constitutional knowledge on the part of the originators of the bill or the prejudices of the people against the appointees of the President?

I might preface what I am about to say with the remark that I have no sympathy with the attack made directly or by innuendo on Senator Vance. He, I believe, did what he thought to be his duty, and there can be no doubt that no officer whose election is not provided for in the constitution can be elected.

I think, however, that there is no necessity for the warehousemen, or other people engaged in carrying out the provisions of the bill, to be United States officers.

The Constitution of the United States prohibits the States from "emitting bills of credit." In 1820, or prior thereto, money being scarce, the State of Kentucky to "relieve the distresses of the community," as the act declares, incorporated a bank of which the State furnished all the capital and received the dividends. The president and directors were elected by the legislature, and the president was required to make a report to each session of the legislature. Notwithstanding that the president and directors were elected by the legislature; that the president had to make a report to the legislature; that the State furnished all the capital; owned all the stock, and received all the dividends, the Supreme Court of the United States held, in Briscoe v. The Bank, 11 Peters, that the officers of this bank were not even the agents of the State of Kentucky, much less its officers, and that consequently the bills issued by the bank and received in payment of public dues, were not bills of credit as they were not issued by the State.

Under the present banking law of the United States the bills issued are secured by the promise of the United States, yet no one can presume that the officers of a national bank who issued these bills was an officer of the United States.

Cannot the ingenuity of man devise a plan by which the appointment of warehousemen may not be necessary? The people were in distress; the legislature of Kentucky wished to relieve them by furnishing them with a paper currency; the Constitution of the United States forbids the State from issuing paper currency; the legislature of Kentucky devised a means of supplying the currency, and of evading the inhibition at the same time. Are not men as ingenious as they were then?

I submit, with some diffidence, that if the United States Congress would enact that whenever the people of a county would signify a desire to be warded to keep it, and have the keeper to execute a proper bond for faithful performance of his duties, that the Treasurer of the United States shall cause the warehouse to be built, and furnish the said keeper with certificates to be furnished to persons who would deposit produce in accordance with the plan of the bill; and make the issuing of these certificates otherwise than in the law provided, a crime punishable as counterfeiting; that the keeper of the warehouse would not be an officer of the United States, the objects of the bill would be subserved, and the interests of the public protected.

I believe, too, that the Supreme Court of the United States would hold the law to be constitutional. The salary of the keeper might be provided for by a State law, or the county might pay him, or the depositors might allow him a percentage on the products stored.

The people of the world have for centuries felt that they were being enslaved by the money power and the power of Kings. The remedies they have instinctively sought to relieve them from these oppressions have been paper money and written constitutions. It was reserved for the American people to find safety in a written constitution, and I believe that they, too, have about found the true solution to the paper money difficulty by issuing paper certificates on actual value deposited. There is a much closer alliance between the tyranny of gold and the tyranny of Kings than a casual observer would be apt to think.

W. C. MUNROE.

Goldsboro, N. C., Aug. 1st, 1890.

THE DEMOCRATIC CHART.

The Plan of Organization of the Democratic Party.

DEM. CENTRAL EX. COMMITTEE.

The following is the plan of organization heretofore adopted by the State Democratic Committee for the guidance of the party.

Township Organization.

1. The unit of county organization shall be the township. In each township there shall be an Executive Committee, to consist of five active Democrats, who shall be elected by the Democratic voters of the several townships in meetings called by the County Executive Committee. And said committee so elected shall elect one of its members as chairman, who shall preside at all committee meetings.

2. The several township executive committees shall convene at the meetings of the several county conventions, or at any time and place that a majority of them may elect, and shall elect a county executive committee, to consist of not less than five members, one of whom shall be designated as chairman, who shall preside at all of said committee meetings.

3. In case there shall be a failure on the part of any township to elect its executive committee for the period of thirty days, the county executive committee shall appoint said committee from the Democratic voters of said township.

4. The members of the township committee shall elect to any vacancy occurring in said committee.

5. The county executive committee shall call all necessary county conventions by giving at least ten days notice by public advertisement in three public

places in each township, at the court house door, and in any Democratic newspaper that may be published in said county, requesting all Democrats of the county to meet in convention in their respective townships on a common day therein stated, which said day shall not be less than three days before the meeting of the county convention, for the purpose of electing their delegates to the county conventions so held, shall elect their delegates to represent the townships in the county conventions from the voters of the respective townships, which delegates, or such of them as shall attend, shall vote the full Democratic strength of their respective townships on all questions that may come before the said county conventions. In case no convention shall be held in any township in pursuance of said call, or no election shall be made, the township executive committee shall appoint such delegates.

6. Each township shall be entitled to cast in the county convention one vote for every twenty-five Democratic votes, and one vote for fractions of fifteen Democratic votes cast by that township at the last preceding gubernatorial election: PROVIDED, That every township shall be entitled to cast at least one vote, and each township may send as many delegates as it may see fit.

7. In cases where townships consist of more than one ward or precinct, each of said wards or precincts shall be entitled to send delegates to county conventions, and shall cast its proportionate part of its township's vote, based upon the last preceding vote for Governor in said township.

8. The chairman of township committees shall preside at all township conventions. In their absence any member of said committee may preside.

9. In cases where all the township executive committees are required to meet for the purpose of electing county executive committees, said meetings shall be deemed to have a quorum when a majority of such townships shall be represented in said meeting.

County and District Conventions.

1. The several county conventions shall be entitled to elect to their Senatorial, judicial and Congressional conventions one delegate for every fifty Democratic votes, and one delegate for fractions over twenty-five Democratic votes cast at the last preceding gubernatorial election in their respective counties, and none but delegates or alternates shall be entitled to seats in said conventions: PROVIDED, That every county shall have at least one vote in said conventions.

2. The chairman, or in his absence, any member of the county senatorial, judicial and congressional committee, shall call to order their respective conventions, and hold their chairmanship thereof until the convention shall elect its chairman.

3. The executive committees of the senatorial, congressional and judicial districts, respectively, shall at the call of their respective chairmen, meet at some time and place in their respective districts, designated in said call. And it shall be their duty to appoint the time and place for holding conventions in their respective districts; and the chairman of said respective committees shall immediately notify the chairman of the different county executive committees of said appointment, and the said county executive committee shall forthwith call some county to said notice, to send delegates to said respective district conventions.

State Conventions.

1. The State convention shall be composed of delegates appointed by the several county conventions. Each county shall be entitled to elect one delegate and one alternate for every one hundred and fifty Democratic votes, and one delegate for fractions over seventy-five Democratic votes cast therein at the last gubernatorial election; and none but delegates or alternates so elected shall be entitled to seats in said convention: PROVIDED, That every county shall have at least one vote in said convention.

General Rules.

1. Such delegates (or alternates of absent delegates) as may be present at any Democratic convention shall be allowed to cast the whole vote to which their township or county may be entitled.

2. If no delegate or alternate shall attend a State convention from any county, any person appointed by the president of the county convention, or on his failure by its secretary, may represent the county.

3. In all conventions provided for by this system, after a vote is cast there shall be no change in such vote until the final result of the ballot shall be announced by the chairman of said convention.

4. All Democratic Executive Committees shall have the power to fill any vacancy occurring in their respective bodies.

5. That the chairman of the different county conventions shall certify the list of delegates and alternates to the different districts and State Conventions, and a certified list of said delegates and alternates to the State Conventions shall be sent to the secretary of the State committee. For the committee.

LATE NEWS NOTES.

The publishers of the Monroe Register have purchased the subscription list of the Monroe Enquirer, and will consolidate the two papers.

Mr. Lee S. Overman purchased last Monday, and sent to the penitentiary at Raleigh, ten bound pups, to be trained to track escaped convicts. They were of the beagle breed and came from one of our county fox hunters.—Salisbury Watchman.

It is now definitely announced that Senator Vance will deliver an address at the fair of the Lumber River Industrial and Live Stock Association, at Red Springs, Friday, August 15. The fair will be held on the 14th, 15th and 16th, and several thousand visitors are expected.—Wilmington Star.

Capt. John F. Divine, General Superintendent and Mr. R. B. Dunn, engineer of roadway, of the A. O. L. made a visit yesterday to Kinston to inspect the new bridge across the river there. It is thought that the road will be in operation from Kinston by the first of September next.—Wilmington Star.

A thirteen year old son of Rev. William Phillips, a well-known Baptist minister who lives three miles from Mount Airy, accidentally shot and killed himself. He was alone with the younger children at the house, and took down a gun for the purpose, it is supposed, of cleaning it. The gun was discharged, the entire load entering the breast of the lad, tearing his heart to pieces.—Greensboro Patriot.